

Remarks

Claims 1-26, 28, 31-40, 42, and 45-49 are currently pending. Claims 1, 2, 11, 19-21, 28, 31, 37, 42, and 47-49 have been amended while claims 27, 29, 30, 41, 43, and 44 have been cancelled. Applicants assert that all claims are now in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings due to errors in FIGS. 4 and 5. A replacement FIG. 4 is enclosed and provides output to block 412 as No and output to block 416 as Yes. A replacement FIG. 5 is enclosed and now states “at SSP”, which is believed to be more accurate than the correction suggested by the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objections to the drawings now be withdrawn.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification in relation to no support for one trigger activating another trigger as recited in claims 27 and 41. These claims have now been cancelled rendering the objection moot. Applicants request that the objections to the specification now be withdrawn.

Claims

The Examiner also objected to claims 27, 33, and 41. As noted above, claims 27 and 41 have been cancelled rendering the objection moot. Claim 31 has been amended remove the recitation of “a computer” such that “a computer” in claim 33 is no longer unclear. Applicants request that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

112 Rejections

Claims 31-36 and 48 and 49 have been rejected as being indefinite. The recitation of “a computer” has been removed from claim 31, thereby overcoming the rejection to claims 31-36. The dependency of claims 48 and 49 has been changed so that claim 46 provides the proper antecedent basis for “the database,” thereby overcoming the rejection to claims 48 and 49.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-49 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of prior art including Devillier (US Pat 6,366,661) in view of Meubus (US Pat 6,212,261), Dunn (US Pat 5,917,817), White (US Pat 6,014,379), Bajzath (US Pat 6,144,644), Fleischer (US Pat 5,974,133) Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Each of the independent claims of this case have been amended to recite language similar to that of claim 1. Claim 1 currently recites in part, wherein the controller sends a call processing request to the gateway through one of the communication links when the controller receives the query, wherein the controller sends an instruction to the switch to park the incoming communication at the gateway, wherein the switch parks the communication at the gateway through one of the communication links in response to the instruction, wherein the gateway communicates with the computer network to obtain a response to the query from the controller to process the communication, and wherein the switch processes the incoming communication in accordance with the response.

Thus, claim 1 and the other independent claims now include recitations to a gateway that communicates with a computer network to obtain a response to a query regarding how to handle an incoming communication where the query to the gateway is from a communication link distinct from the computer network. Furthermore, these claims include recitations to the incoming call being parked at the gateway while it is being determined how to handle the incoming call. In particular, claim 1 provides for the controller to provide the query to the gateway while the switch parks the incoming call at the gateway.

None of the cited references appear to disclose, singly or in combination, systems and methods whereby a gateway communicates with the computer network to obtain a response to the query regarding how to handle the incoming communication while the incoming communication is also parked at the gateway. With particular reference to claim 1, none of the prior art references, singly or in combination, appear to disclose the controller sending the query to the gateway for communication through the computer

network while the switch parks the incoming communication at the gateway. For at least these reasons, all pending claims are allowable over the cited combinations of references.


Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-26, 28, 31-40, 42, and 45-49 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees beyond the fee for a one month extension of time are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 15, 2004


Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093